REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-20 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claim 17 is cancelled herein.

Therefore, claims 1-16 and 18-20 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-16 and 18-20 are rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-12, 14, 16, 19, and 20 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR § 1.116

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because:

(a) the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicant believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;

(b) the amendments of the claims should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and

(c) the amendments do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview of December 7, 2004. At the Interview Applicant discussed the Tenev and Camacho references. Applicant presented the position that Camacho selects a connector by direct user designation (e.g. clicking on it) and then another user command initiates an edit. Applicant also presented the position that Tenev drags an entire view (i.e. an entire graph) rather than dragging an element of a graph. As stated in the Examiner's Interview Summary, "Tenev does not specifically teach dragging a node as claimed by the Applicant. Examiner agrees ... Camacho does not teach dragging a node; but he does teach interactively manipulating nodes by selection and input commands to change node positions" (emphasis added).

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that based on the Interview it is established that at least claims 15, 16, 18, and 19 are patentable over Tenev and/or Camacho.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for bringing application number 09/739,840 to Applicant's attention.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, claims 1, 5, 8-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. The Examiner alleged that the claim recitation of "criteria" is not supported by the specification. Support is found in the discussion of the second embodiment and the accompanying figures. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §§ 102 AND 103

In the Office Action, at page 4, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Tenev. At pages 5-13, claims 1-16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Camacho in view of Tenev. These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 17 is cancelled for the purpose of reducing the effort required by the Examiner and under Applicant's belief that other claims cover similar or broader aspects of claim 17.

As mentioned above, based on the Interview and the Examiner's summary thereof, Applicant has shown that at least claims 15, 16, 18, and 19 are patentable over Tenev and/or Camacho. The other amendments to the claims herein were discussed at the Interview. Furthermore, it is respectfully noted that movement relative to a graph etc. is already present in various claims that recite "in relation to", determining when the movement or dragging overlaps, etc.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 2 recites that "the criteria is met when the first connector and the third object overlap each other during the moving of the third object on the display, in response to the automatic designating said interactive graphical editing unit also automatically creates and displays the second and third connectors". This feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/10/2004

By: _____ PTO Reg. 41,307
Mehdi Sheikerz

James T. Strom
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501